

CONSOLIDATION OF NBCD EQUIPMENT - MROC COORDINATION MEETING

7-31-03

1.0 DATE AND TIME.

July 31, 2003.

2.0 LOCATION.

Not specified.

3.0 ATTENDEES.

Not specified.

4.0 ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES.

None.

5.0 SCOPE OR PURPOSE.

This meeting was to provide clarification of the plan for the consolidation of NBCD Equipment. Both Lant and Pac required greater definition of the Courses of Action that were presented in the Pre-MROC brief on NBCD Reconstitution.

6.0 DISCUSSION.

In reference to MARFORPAC:

6.1 I MEF Facilities.

a. Concern.

There is a concern about availability of facility upgrade funding and the source of that funding.

b. Clarification

The CLS provider will accomplish facility upgrades. The CLS provider will participate in the facility assessment. He will make facility recommendations and the government will approve or disapprove. The CLS provider will implement approved facility recommendations.

a. Concern.

Desire funding for displaced units if facilities are found.

b. Clarification.

Funding was planned for the transportation of NBCD items. Transportation of other items has not been addressed or therefore funded. PM will execute as directed.

6.2 T/A.

a. Concern.

Can the T/A be managed in the CIF, inclusive of masks? If not in the CIF at all bases, then leave as status quo (the concern is that the units don't want to maintain the T/A)?

b. Clarification.

The T/A will not be managed in the CIF, because that is a different contractor than we need for the CLS. However, the CLS contractor will manage the T/A. This approach will meet the PAC concern.

a. Concern.

There is only one CSF for I MEF and that's at Pendleton. This concern is two-fold. First, it pertains to being able to talk to one person (i.e. a single CLS facility in charge) and get what you need. Second, there is a budget concern that multiple sites will be more costly.

b. Clarification.

There will be a single POC for this NBCD consolidation effort (1-800-NBCD). This will be located in Quantico. This approach will meet PACs POC concern. The trade-off on multiple sites is cost vs. responsiveness for homeland defense. We want to confirm that the homeland defense concern is considered.

a. Concern.

There needs to be inclusion of III MEF in the planning.

b. Clarification.

III MEF has been included in the planning all along. It's key that the briefing needs to be clear in the nature of the III MEF role/impact in the move to CLS.

a. Concern.

We cannot address T/A until a COA is approved by MROC.

b. Clarification.

Concur.

a. Concern.

Is there a requirement to finish facilities before moving to centralized management of assets?

b. Clarification.

Equipment is in some facility today. Centralized management can and should start ASAP and then we can evolve to the end state.

6.3 G-5

a. Concern.

There are homeland defense problems relative to only having NBCD assets at one site (Pendleton) and no CSFs at other I MEF bases.

b. Clarification.

The closer the assets are to the potential targets the better. Concur with the concern and request PAC confirm their position in view of the Homeland Defense issues.

6.4 G-3

a. Concern.

Will there be one person in charge at HQMC level?

b. Clarification.

Col Monroe, PPO, is the HQ single point of contact.

a. Concern.

Can there be a road show at conclusion of MROC?

b. Clarification.

Absolutely.

a. Concern.

Can PPO send a P-4 to highlight the driving concern behind this effort?

b. Clarification.

Yes.

a. Concern.

Both MEFs want hierarchy of senior/subordinate CSFs for a single POC.

b. Clarification.

The single POC will be in Quantico.

7.0 WHITE GEAR – CLARIFICATIONS.

- ENBC (MEU) continue status quo for provisioning and maintenance. TAV required on DEMP.
- Other MCB white gear, TAV will be required.
- Possibility of consolidating white gear may be considered down the road.

8.0 LOGCOM INPUT TO CONSOLIDATION PLAN.

MPF fielding/requisitioning will be managed through Central Processing Facility.

9.0 WAR RESERVE.

Requisitioning will be through the Central Processing Facility.

10.0 MARFORLANT

a. Concern.

Who mans the consolidated facilities: marines, civilians, and/or CLS?

b. Clarification.

CLS only.

a. Concern.

Facilities, same as MARFORPAC.

b. Clarification.

As addressed above for MARFORPAC.

a. Concern.

T/A, same as MARFORPAC.

b. Clarification.

As addressed above for MARFORPAC.

a. Concern.

Revised SORTS reporting method has to be identified.

b. Clarification.

PP/O will address.

a. Concern.

Requirements for facilities at Quantico and Norfolk.

In support of unique operational requirements of CBIRF, MSG Bn, 8th and I, MCSF Bn, TBS, etc.

b. Clarification.

Concur with consolidated facilities for Quantico and Norfolk. This will be addressed in a phased implementation plan. CBIRF already considered consolidated. All specialized units requiring NBCD support (e.g. for fielding, replacement/replenishment, and maintenance) would be provided through the Centralized Management effort.

a. Concern.

Size of MEF Contingency Blocks, 3 MEUs, ACM, MEB.

b. Clarification.

Contingency blocks for MEUs and MEBs were initially addressed as an interim requirement for COA 2. The intent was that the contingency block

requirement (separate blocks sized to MAGTFs) would go away once assets were returned to the facilities. The capability to draw gear in support of MEUs and MEBs will be resident within the facilities. Additional contingency requirements, such as ACM, etc., will be accommodated.

a. Concern.

Contingency blocks to support geographically dispersed units must be assessed and defined at such areas as northern VA.

b. Clarification.

Concur with requirement. Will be addressed with phased implementation plan.

11.0 FUTURE PLANS.

None specified.